

STRATEGY
RESEARCH
PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

**THE CITIZEN SOLDIER IN THE UNITED STATES
NATIONAL SECURITY CALCULUS**

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL BRUCE OLIVEIRA
UNITED STATES ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2001



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

20010621 124

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

THE CITIZEN SOLDIER IN THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY CALCULUS

by

LTC Bruce Oliveira
ARNG

COL Jeffrey L. Groh
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government, the Department of Defense, or any of its agencies.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:
Approved for public release.
Distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Bruce E. Oliveira (LTC), ARNG

TITLE: THE CITIZEN SOLDIER IN THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY
CALCULUS

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 10 April 2001 PAGES: 37 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP) in support of NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP), provides opportunities for emerging democracies to create a foundation for full participation in a shared environment of regional and international military, political, and economic activities. To this end, the SPP is an appropriate mission for the role of the citizen soldier.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	vii
THE CITIZEN SOLDIER IN THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY CALCULUS	1
THE NATIONAL GUARD ENGAGING AND SHAPING THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT	1
A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE.....	2
THE NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORTING NATIONAL SECURITY AND NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGIES	3
THE NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORTING UNITED STATES INTERESTS AND STRATEGY FOR EUROPE.....	5
SYNERGISTIC ELEMENTS OF EUROPEAN SECURITY.....	6
USEUCOM Strategy	7
Partnership for Peace with National Guard Enhancement	8
Joint Contact Team Program with National Guard Enhancement.....	9
The National Guard State Partnership Program	11
NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM CHALLENGES.....	14
CONCLUSIONS	16
ENDNOTES	19
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	23

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURE 1	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE NATIONS	8
FIGURE 2	JOINT CONTACT TEAM NATIONS	9
FIGURE 3	STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM NATIONS.....	11

THE CITIZEN SOLDIER IN THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY CALCULUS

THE NATIONAL GUARD ENGAGING AND SHAPING THE INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

We have learned that we cannot live alone at peace. We have learned that our own well being is dependent on the well being of other nations far away. We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.

— President Franklin Delano Roosevelt

This study argues that the National Guard is uniquely suited to participate in efforts to build democratic institutions. Furthermore, the State Partnership Program (SPP) maximizes the advantages its citizen-soldier brings to initiatives to engage and shape the international environment in support of the national security strategy. The evidence found validates the uniqueness of the National Guard as a force multiplier and the SPP as a vital enhancement to peacetime engagement programs.

Now that the Cold War is over, the United States should chart a new course being cognizant of successes and mistakes following previous upheavals in the international system. The United States must lead the world in preventing the conditions for conflict and in creating the conditions for peace with a policy of preventive defense. An influential component of the National Guard's Federal role is that of Preventive Defense.

The National Guards international efforts actively support the National Security Strategy of the United States. It builds on the premise that the United States will remain globally engaged to shape the international environment and create conditions favorable to US interests and global security. The program's goals reflect an evolving international affairs mission for the National Guard, and promote regional stability and civil-military relationships in support of U.S. policy objectives.

The National Guard is uniquely positioned to support nation-building programs abroad. Under the auspices of the National Guard's State Partnership Program, National Guard personnel participate in various command-sponsored engagements. The National Guard participates in programs such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Partnership for Peace program, European Command's Joint Contact Team Program, and other similar activities sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff and various State Department Agencies.

Much of the Guard's success in promoting democracy abroad is the result of the State Partnership Program. Twenty-nine countries are now partnered with thirty states and one U.S.

territory. The National Guard State Partnership Program serves as a compelling example of military subordination to civilian authority, emphasizing the apolitical role of the military in a democracy. Guard members also demonstrate the necessity and economy of Reserve Components with the ability to react immediately to civil and military emergencies.

The Guard illustrates how a military force of the people remains committed to the people. Long-term community-to-community and people-to-people relationships are developed and aid in building a stable environment for emerging democracies. The wealth of civilian skills guard members take overseas – and the diversity of non-military professions they represent – are important, giving Guard personnel a versatility and credibility as goodwill ambassadors that no other American military arm can match.

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

A brief historical look will demonstrate how the National Guard plays a key engagement role. In 1997, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Lieutenant General Edward D. Baca, provided the following vision for the National Guard State Partnership Program: "Build genuine state partnerships which mobilize the entire social fabric of American support to democracy abroad. Capitalizing on the unique role of the National Guard citizen-soldiers, we will aggressively engage at home and abroad to promote stability by strengthening democracy and free market economies. We will assist in the construction of democratic institutions and the social infrastructure necessary to sustain a democratic tradition. Partnerships will create long-term personal relationships based on openness, confidence, and trust."¹

Twice before in this century, America has had opportunities to preempt the conditions for armed conflict. After World War I, the United States had the chance to support the peaceful resolution of conflict by joining the League of Nations and engaging in the world. Instead, the nation chose isolationism. This strategy of isolationism, coupled with the Europeans' insistence on reparations and the avoidance of collective responsibility, failed to prevent the resumption of world war.

After World War II, America chose the path of engagement. We joined the United Nations and promoted a postwar program of reconciliation and reconstruction. George C. Marshall set forth the policy of preventive defense in his 1947 commencement speech at Harvard University. This came to be known as the Marshall Plan. Three dimensions of the Marshall Plan increase in significance with the passage of time. First, the events in Europe affect America. Second, the economic reconstruction of Europe was critical to preventing another war. The third aspect is the economic reconstruction in Europe would not happen without United States leadership.²

Marshall's preventive defense program was successful in creating the conditions of peace wherever it was applied, but it was only half realized. Joseph Stalin, leader of the Soviet Union, refused the United States' offer of assistance. Within a matter of years, the world was divided into two factions. Deterrence, not prevention, became the United States' overarching security strategy of the Cold War. After forty dangerous years, during which the world lived with the possibility of nuclear war, the Soviet Bloc collapsed in 1989. As a result, the entire nature and purpose of United States security arrangements drastically changed: No longer was the goal of the United States to stop East Bloc T-72 tanks from rolling through the Fulda Gap. Rather, the U.S. had to rapidly transform its framework and focus to enhance democracy and free markets. Secretary of Defense William Perry explained America's security policy in the post-Cold War era in terms of three lines of defense. The first line of defense for America is that of "preventive defense," with "deterrence the second line of defense, and "military conflict" the third and last resort. "Preventive defense creates the conditions that support peace, making war less likely and deterrence unnecessary.³

The United States is at a third pivotal point in this century. As described by then-Secretary of Defense William Perry, " we are at a point between a Cold War that is over and a peace that is not yet secure." The countries of Central and Eastern Europe are faced with the challenge of not only establishing immediate political order, but also dealing with economic and social chaos. In their quests for a peaceful transition to democracy and economic social viability, these countries approached the West for guidance and assistance. Secretary Perry asserted that: "...America must lead the world in preventing the conditions for conflict and in creating the conditions for peace. In short, we must lead with a policy of preventive defense.⁴ By helping to forge networks of people and institutions working together to preserve freedom, promote democracy, and build free markets, the National Guard's State Partnership Program became an integral part of promoting this defense strategy.

THE NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORTING NATIONAL SECURITY AND NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGIES

The National Guard State Partnership Program builds "Bridges to America" by providing links between the United States and partnered nations. These bridges promote the exchange of free ideas and reinforce our common pursuit of peace, stability, and democracy around the world⁵ Special emphasis is placed on the principle of civilian control over the military. There is no better illustration of this concept than the National Guard and its special part in our federal system of government.

Through their roles in their communities, members of the National Guard provide a means to engage the entire social fabric of the United States of America. Citizen-soldiers and airmen convey social responsibility, the value of respecting individual rights, and the benefits of a free-market economy. Demonstrating American commitment to these values—and showing how they promote a strong and successful society—will set the example for maturing and emerging democracies.

America stands today as the lone superpower in a unipolar system, threats to its interests abound in the form of states of concern, revolutionary dictatorships, and others who would initiate conflict to achieve selfish ends. As long as there are governments with offensive military power who are not accountable to their own people, the world will remain a dangerous place. The United States must continue to plan for threats to its national security.

Shaping the United States' national security strategies—and defining national interests—continues to become more difficult. Technological revolution is causing a continual reassessment of capabilities and requirements. Meanwhile, the world economy is becoming increasingly interdependent.

Guidance from the National Command Authorities, as expressed by the National Security Strategy and the National Military Strategy emphasizes the need to shape the international environment through *engagement*. Through engagement we increase stability and keep the threat of conflict at the lowest level possible. By engaging during peacetime, we shape the security environment, develop coalition partners, help prevent crises from occurring, and deter violence and armed conflict⁶

The most significant contribution the State Partnership Program will provide to national security—and the area in which they promise the greatest return for the money spent—is in helping to prevent the emergence of new threats to the United States and in preventing the re-emergence of former threats. Reinforcing democratic institutions, and promoting the ideals of cooperative relationships among nations, will reduce the likelihood that these countries will engage in military conflict with United States or other democratic nations.

The Gulf War confirmed the value of coalition warfare and highlighted the challenges of maintaining coalitions during regional conflicts. By helping to build and reinforce democratic institutions within our associated nations, the National Guard's international initiatives will further the recognition of common interests and the identification of common foes. The trust and personal relationships built through cooperation may encourage partner nations to join with the United States in case of future-armed conflicts. Plus, helping to strengthen democratic

institutions, reinforcing civilian control, and increasing military professionalism will make collaborative nations more capable and reliable allies.

Cooperation from emerging and maturing democracies may prove particularly important in countering asymmetric threats such as terrorism and the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. Capable and committed associate nations can assist the United States in a myriad of ways: providing intelligence, bringing diplomatic pressure to bear and participating in economic sanctions against states of concern; employing their own criminal justice systems to punish terrorists as well as fight organized crime and illegal trafficking in drugs, weapons of mass destruction, or other destructive contraband; and denying safe havens for terrorists and other fugitives guilty of attacking the interests of the United States and its allies.

Working with partner nations during international activities will make National Guard soldiers and airmen more proficient in their state and federal missions to provide military support to civilian authorities (MSCA). Combined and international exercises give National Guard units outstanding opportunities to train on MSCA tasks such as responding to natural disasters or providing humanitarian relief. Many partner nations have vast experience in MSCA operations. Our counterparts can teach United States personnel a great deal about operations such as urban search and rescue, containment of hazardous materials following catastrophic accidents, and the use of military equipment in response and recovery following earthquakes, floods, and other natural disasters. Collaboration in such training clearly benefits the citizens of all the countries involved.

THE NATIONAL GUARD SUPPORTING UNITED STATES INTERESTS AND STRATEGY FOR EUROPE

The National Guard's most significant contribution to the promotion of U.S. security interests comes through its role in three engagement programs. The three programs are the National Guard's State Partnership Program (SPP), USEUCOM's Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP) and NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP). During the last seven years, the National Guard participation has shown that linking individual states to developing democratic nations in Europe promotes security in the region.⁷ The engagement programs demonstrate the unique advantages and potential of the National Guard in assisting emerging democracies.

The United States has an abiding interest in the security of its Western allies. Two world wars have demonstrated Europe's importance to the United States, and ties between the two are even more important in an era of economic globalization. The United States cannot

promote democratic values globally without strong partners, first and foremost in Europe. Failure to preserve European harmony would seriously affect U.S. interests.⁸

The United States has two strategic goals in Europe. The first is to build a Europe that is truly integrated, democratic, prosperous and at peace. Our second goal is to work with our allies and partners across the Atlantic to meet the global challenges no nation can meet alone. This means working together to consolidate this region's historic transition in favor of democracy and free markets; to support peace efforts in troubled regions; to tackle global threats such as environmental and health problems, terrorism, drug trafficking, the spread of weapons of mass destruction and other potentially dangerous technologies; and to build a more open world economy without barriers to transatlantic trade and investment.⁹

SYNERGISTIC ELEMENTS OF EUROPEAN SECURITY

The USEUCOM strategy, which directly supports the National Security Strategy and the National Military Strategy, is called Engagement and Preparedness. The USEUCOM Commander-in Chief has articulated that his "aim is to reduce the conditions that lead to conflict through engagement," and that "engagement activities have a tremendous beneficial "impact" promoting democratic ideals and principals, and we will continue to pursue peacetime engagement vigorously."¹⁰

The President's National Security Strategy states that our national three core objectives are to:

- Enhance our security with effective diplomacy and with military forces that are ready to fight and win;
- Bolster America's economic prosperity;
- Promote democracy abroad.¹¹

The Chairman's National Military Strategy derives from the National Security Strategy that:

Our national military objectives are to promote Peace and Stability and where necessary, to defeat adversaries that threaten the United States, our interests, or our allies.¹²

The United States faces a dynamic and uncertain European security environment replete with both opportunities and challenges. Optimistically we are in a period of strategic opportunity. Our core values of representative democracy and market economics are embraced in many parts of Europe, creating new opportunities to promote peace, prosperity, and

enhanced cooperation among nations. Alliances, such as NATO, which have been so critical to the U.S. security, are adapting successfully to meet today's challenges and remain the foundation for stability and prosperity in Europe.¹³

USEUCOM Strategy

In light of the realities of shrinking defense budgets and increased operations tempo, greater reliance on the National Guard is essential to USEUCOM. General Wesley K. Clark, former Commander-in-Chief USEUCOM, summed up the net effect of the citizen soldier's contributions while testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 29, 2000:

"Forces of the Reserve Components have been extremely productive and beneficial to USEUCOM. Our goal is to enhance integration and employment of Reserve Component forces in all our operations, both peacetime and contingency.

Over recent years the reserve forces contribution to USEUCOM's mission has become a critical enabler and force multiplier for success in contingency operations and engagement programs. During FY'99, Reserve Components provided over 1.1 million man-days to USEUCOM missions helping to offset the strain on forward deployed and rotationally deployed units. We must maintain adequate force levels of our Reserve Components in order to continue the outstanding support provided by our military citizen soldiers.

Continued funding authorizations to the reserve components to leverage reserve strengths overseas helps offset the significant OPTEMPO within the theater. An example is the plan for the Army's active component to rotate command and control responsibilities for Bosnia-Herzegovina with the Army National Guard.¹⁴

As Charles Cragin, Principal Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness indicates, "The Reservists today perform many vital functions, from aerial refueling to military police, from civil affairs to medical support. The bottom line is that we cannot go to war, enforce a peace agreement or undertake prolonged humanitarian missions anywhere in the world today without calling on the Guard and Reserve."¹⁵ In fact, in almost every major USEUCOM, NATO or United Nations operation, including Operation Deny Flight, Deliberate Force, Task Force Able Sentry, Joint Endeavor and Joint Guard, the National Guard and the Reserves have proved invaluable to the operation. As important as these operations are to current stability of the region, less known engagement programs may be the National Guard's most important contribution to long-term security in the region.

Three engagement programs that help to accomplish these goals are today helping to maintain stability and promote U.S. national security. These three programs are administered

and promoted by different entities but operationally create a synergistic effect that helps keep the peace and promise to provide an even more stable and prosperous future for all of Europe. The three programs are the National Guard's State Partnership Program (SPP), USEUCOM's Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP) and NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP). The National Guard is directly involved in executing all three of these programs.¹⁶

The SPP, JCTP and PfP all involve direct military to military contact that builds trust between military members who often were enemies less than a decade ago. These engagement events "serve to demonstrate our commitment; improve interoperability, reassure allies, friends and coalition partners; promote transparency; convey democratic ideals; deter aggression; and help relieve sources of instability before they can become military crises."¹⁷

Partnership for Peace with National Guard Enhancement

•Albania	•Latvia
•Bulgaria	•Lithuania
•Croatia	•Moldova
•Czech Republic	•Poland
•Estonia	•Romania
•Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	•Slovenia
•Georgia	•Slovakia
•Hungary	•Ukraine

FIGURE 1 PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE NATIONS

The first and most visible Peace Engagement Program that the National Guard supports is NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP). In the post-Cold War era, NATO has reaffirmed its place at the core of the transatlantic security through the sponsorship of the Partnership for Peace. NATO established the PfP program in January 1994, "within the Framework of the

North Atlantic Cooperation Council." The program noted that "each subscribing state will develop with NATO an individual Partnership Program" and "NATO will consult with any active participant in the Partnership if that Partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security."¹⁸ The Program aims at enhancing respective peace-keeping abilities and capabilities through joint planning, training and exercises, and by doing so increasing the interoperability of the Partner country's military forces with those of NATO. It also aims at facilitating transparency in national defense planning and budgeting processes and in the democratic control of defense forces.

The concept of a Partnership for Peace was seen as an opportunity for the United States to enhance democracy and free markets throughout Europe in an effort to maintain stability. The intent was that, with relatively small investments by the United States and NATO, interested former Soviet states could be placed on a track leading to democracy and market economies. In mid 1996 the Alliance decided to further enhance the role of the Partnership, building on its momentum and success. In spring 1997 Allied Foreign and Defense Ministers launched a wide range of enhancement measures, which have added a new quality to PfP and have substantively strengthened it in political, security, military and institutional fields.¹⁹

Joint Contact Team Program with National Guard enhancement

•Albania	•Lithuania
•Armenia	•FYROM
•Azerbaijan	•Malta
•Austria	•Moldova
•Belarus	•Poland
•Bulgaria	•Romania
•Czech Republic	•Russia
•Estonia	•Slovakia
•Finland	•Slovenia
•Georgia	•Sweden
•Hungary	•Turkmenistan
•Kazakhstan	•Ukraine
•Latvia	•Uzbekistan

FIGURE 2 JOINT CONTACT TEAM NATIONS

The Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP) is the foundation for USEUCOM's engagement programs in Central Europe and the New Independent States. The program supports the USEUCOM strategic objectives of stability, democratization, military professionalism, and closer relationships with NATO while also responding to host nation requirements. The JCTP is planned, funded and controlled by USEUCOM. However, the personnel involved in every level of the JCTP come from a mix of Active, Guard and Reserve professionals.

The key to JCTP success is the Military Liaison Team (MLT). The MLTs coordinate and execute events to provide essential infrastructure-building information while presenting the U.S. Armed forces as a role model of a capable military under effective civilian control.²⁰ The continuous contact with these emerging democracies demonstrates American values and ensures experiences are shared in a natural, positive dialogue.

Military Liaison Teams are composed of three to five members, typically a jointly staffed mix of active duty and reserve personnel. Deployed in country, MLTs are the key elements in bringing U.S. military expertise to bear on a wide range of issues. The MLTs interface primarily with the Minister of Defense and the General Staff. Military Liaison Teams are headed by an MLT-Chiefs who are either senior officers from the Active component or members of the National Guard or Reserves from the nation's partner U.S. State. Military Liaison Teams often represent the United States first military contact with many of these nations. It is through this initial contact that bonds of trust and mutual respect can begin to build between the U.S. and host nation. Over six thousand military-to-military events coordinated by these teams have helped host nations address such fundamental topics as human rights guarantees for soldiers, civilian control of the military, establishment of military legal codes, and programs to develop professional noncommissioned officers and chaplaincies.²¹

JCTP consists of five basic types of events that are conducted by all services. A Traveling Contact Team (TCT) goes to the host nation and shares information on how the U.S. conducts business. Familiarization Visits send limited numbers of key foreign military personnel to U.S. installations in Western Europe or the United States when the scope or level of the event makes a Traveling Contact Team impractical. Conferences are conducted when multiple nations have mutual interests in a subject. A limited number of individual exchanges of subject matter experts allow in-depth exposure to U.S. operations. Finally, maximum use is made of U.S. ship visits to conduct multiple events at a low cost.

Even though PfP, JCTP and SPP are separate programs with separate proponents and funding, the resulting effects are synergistic. Only with continued involvement and expertise from the National Guard and Reserves will these valuable outreach programs be possible. This

implies a need for the National Guard and Reserves to continue to evaluate their training and processes to improve their ability to accomplish these new kinds of missions. The SPP provides the best opportunity for enhancing the National Guard's role in this regard.

The National Guard State Partnership Program

EUCOM		
Maryland / Estonia		
Michigan / Latvia		
Pennsylvania / Lithuania		
Illinois / Poland		
Utah / Belarus	CENTCOM	
Texas/Nebraska* / Czech	Arizona / Kazakhstan	
California / Ukraine	Louisiana / Uzbekistan	
Indiana / Slovakia		
Ohio / Hungary		
Minnesota / Croatia		
South Carolina / Albania	PACOM	
New Jersey*/ Albania	Hawaii / Philippines	
Vermont / Romania		
North Carolina / Moldova		
Colorado / Slovenia		
Georgia / Georgia		
Kansas / Ukraine		
SOUTHCOM		
Puerto Rico / Honduras		
Florida / Venezuela		
Missouri / Panama		
Louisiana / Belize		
Kentucky / Ecuador		
West Virginia / Peru		
Connecticut / Uruguay		
New Hampshire / Belize*		

***Associate Partner States**

FIGURE 3 STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM NATIONS

The purpose of the National Guard State Partnership Program is to build long-standing institutional affiliations and people-to-people relationships with nations while establishing democratic military organizations. By utilizing National Guardsmen in their dual roles as citizen-soldiers, the partner nation's military leaders are encountering highly trained and cost-effective members of the United States Armed Forces. Guardsmen serve as role models in making a compelling case for democracy, professionalism, and deference to civilian authority. They also demonstrate the necessity and economy of Reserve Components with the ability to react immediately to civil and military emergencies. The program's goals reflect an evolving international affairs mission for the National Guard, and are to promote regional stability and civil-military relationships in support of U.S. policy objectives. The objectives of the SPP are:

- Demonstrate military subordination to civilian authority.
- Demonstrate military support to civilian authority.
- Assist in the development of democratic institutions.

- Foster open market economies to help bring stability.
- Project and represent U.S. humanitarian values.²²

In 1992 the government of Latvia asked for help in developing “a national military based on the National Guard model of the citizen soldier.” The Chief of the National Guard Bureau (NGB), Lieutenant General John Conway, “with the approval of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, jumped at the opportunity.”²³ The NGB proposal was followed by the CINCEUR’s decision to staff Military Liaison Teams (MLTs) in the Baltic’s with Reserve Component personnel. The SPP thus began as a bilateral military-to-military contact program with which to engage the countries of central and Eastern Europe, and is a direct outgrowth of U.S. European Command’s (USEUCOM) Joint Contact Team Program (JCTP). It since has grown far beyond JCTP and becomes a hybrid engagement tool, allowing interaction in social and economic - as well as military - spheres. The SPP actively supports the National Military Strategy’s mandate to shape the international security environment.

Currently, a total of thirty US states and one territory are partnered with twenty-nine countries around the world. The State Partners actively participate in a host of engagement activities, ranging from bilateral training and familiarization events, to exercises, to fellowship-style internships, to civic leader visits. All activities are coordinated through the Theater Commanders-in-Chief and the US Ambassadors’ country teams, and other agencies as appropriate, to ensure that National Guard support is tailored optimally to country requirements.

The MLTs play an integral role in executing the SPP events. The mechanism that facilitates further personal contact is through members of the National Guard executing various missions as part of Traveling Contact Teams. Traveling Contact Teams involve National Guard citizen-soldiers traveling to the host nation to give briefings on “civil-military topics such as air search and rescue, medical evacuation, personnel, budgeting, administration, military law, professional military education, disaster response planning, and family programs.”²⁴ While the formal TCT missions are important, it is often the informal contact between American citizen-soldiers and members of the armed forces of the host nations that help build trust and mutual respect between the partners. It is therefore critical that National Guard members be prepared to operate in these foreign cultures. In addition to the TCTs, host-nations send military members on Familiarization Visits to the U.S. The exchange of information is important on FAMS, but like the TCT mission, the contact between the personnel from both sides of the Atlantic is the enabler for the construction of long standing institutional affiliations. Only by both partners getting aquatinted with each other’s military and civilian way of life will the National

Guard be able to make a “compelling case for the ideals of democracy, professionalism, and deference to civilian authority.”²⁵

Military liaison teams, assigned permanently in the host country, can be involved with a wide range of projects at the request of their hosts. The National Guard’s military liaison teams develop work plans with host country ministries of defense and with the US embassy staff. Each plan specifies assistance required by the host-nation to carry out democratic reforms and provides a context within which US strategic objectives can be pursued.

Even though the National Guard is the proponent of the SPP, funding for the program is provided from many different sources depending on the type of event being executed. National Guard Operations and Maintenance funds, Overseas Deployment Training, Traditional CINC Activities, Office of the Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs to include Innovative Readiness Training, JCTP, Temporary Tour of Active Duty, Mobility Training Teams from Security Assistance, PfP Warsaw Initiative Funds only, Cooperative Threat Reduction, International Aid, Joint Chief Staff Exercises Program, and participating nations all contribute funds depending on the event being sponsored. Considering the need to increase the effectiveness of National Security programs within the current financial constraints, the SPP is ideal.

There have been some setbacks as well. For example, the National Guard was criticized by a senior military leader in Albania for creating false expectations when a two-week assistance visit by a North Carolina engineer unit failed to produce the basis for a modern American-style hospital. The Albanian leader said that Walter Reed Hospital was the example of what had been expected. In another instance, the Belarus U.S. country team has canceled National Guard SPP exercises because progress by Belarus toward meeting PfP and SPP criteria has been lacking. Belarus seems more inclined to reunite with Russia on substantive issues than most other newly independent states.²⁶

In spite of the minor setbacks, the SPP has proven to be a successful National Guard outreach program that emphasizes to participating nations the absolute necessity for military subordination to civilian authority in a democratic society. In accomplishing this primary SPP goal, the overarching NSS objective of engagement as a method of shaping the environment to enhance U.S. security is being accomplished. The SPP is a true force multiplier and may provide the most significant contribution to the long-term security interests for the United States in Europe of any other citizen-soldier activity.

NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM CHALLENGES

The value of the SPP is its ability to focus the attention of a small part of the Department of Defense (DoD) – a State National Guard - on a single country or region in support of US Government policies. This concentrated focus allows for the development of long-term personal relationships and a mechanism to catalyze support from outside the DoD, which otherwise would not occur but nevertheless complements US policy.

The optimum SPP partnership is one in which: the Host-Nation professes genuine interest in Partnership; U.S. and Theater engagement objectives are satisfied; the force Protection risk is low; a minimum of additional resources is required to execute engagement; and National Guard core engagement competencies, particularly military support to civil authority (MSCA), are heavily incorporated.

In addition, the following caveats should apply for the continued success of the PfP and SPP programs. First is for the PfP, and in particular the SPP, to refrain from seeking objectives that are unreasonable or that could create expectations that cannot be fulfilled. The National Guard Bureau, for instance, has suggested that the SPP is the new “Marshall Plan” for Europe.²⁷ Unfortunately, the scope and intent of the Marshall Plan exceeds that of the SPP many times over. The work of the PfP program and the SPP can provide only limited opportunities for engagement and involvement when compared to the broad agenda for restructuring the economies and infrastructure of Europe after World War II.

Second, the National Guard should build upon the military to military contact currently in place. The SPP, by involving members of the US National Guard with host countries, has introduced the concept of the citizen soldier to the military and civilian leadership and sought to advance the democratic concept of civilian control over the military in the process. For some host countries, this is a new concept. The idea of soldiers, who are civilians-representing a cross section of occupations and yet forming a capable and deployable military force, is difficult for many in the host countries to grasp. In addition, most host country economies simply cannot create conditions in which an individual can find work as a civilian while at the same time serving as a member of the military and receiving compensation for that service.

Exchanges of individuals or small teams of individuals on a long-term basis should be promoted. These exchanges can either be a shadow arrangement, augmentee, or possibly full-fledged members of an organization. The National Guard citizen-soldier is the best ambassador to present “hometown USA.”

Military Liaison Teams could be established by partnership countries in U.S. states to act as liaisons for FAM events. This would generally improve understanding between the two

nations. In any case, by increased exposure provided by long-term exchanges, the ideals and attributes of the U.S. system can make a more lasting effect.

Additionally, small units should perform their fifteen-day Annual Training in their partnership countries. For example, a Civil Engineer unit could deploy to work on humanitarian civic assistance projects. Creatively, this responsibility could be shared on a rotational basis with all partner state units up to company size without degrading primary warfighting capabilities.

Partner nations could likewise send units to Annual Training events in U.S. states. This would develop a common understanding of military interoperability and foster mutual trust, respect and cooperation between partnerships. Furthermore, select soldiers could be sent to participate in special training events or schools. Like units between the two countries should be married together to facilitate this recommendation.

Third, the SPP has created a level of dialogue within host countries that has fostered discussion of a variety of subjects. Most have been primarily military in nature. In the future, civilian and military representatives from host countries should have opportunities to observe firsthand the conditions that are achievable when democracy and market economies are at work and when both take precedence over the military. The civilian governments of the National Guard partner states need to be brought on line as a full partner in the SPP. As citizen soldiers, the National Guard is uniquely suited in promoting the benefits of open lines of communication between military and civilian leadership. From the State Governor on down the line, more state agencies need to be included if the goal of promoting democracy and advocating civilian control of the military is to be fully conveyed. Familiarization visits should be used to demonstrate how the National Guard works with civilian agencies like the State and local police, Border Patrol, Customs, and State and Federal Emergency Management Agencies. Familiarization visits should expose efforts of lobbying the State Legislature for issues directly affecting National Guard members. Seeing how National Guard members interact with the civil leadership directly supports the goals of the SPP. Sister-city relationships between towns and cities should also be encouraged.

National Guard members that are members and leaders of civic organizations should be taken advantage of to encourage an outreach to like organizations in partner countries. Organizations including Rotary International, Kiwanis Club, Jaycees, Lions Club, and Toastmasters are replete with National Guard personnel. Business organizations including local Chambers of Commerce and Development Corporations should be encouraged to investigate potential business opportunities between the partners. This could be done in conjunction with

or in addition to the State Government increasing its participation. Whether in Europe or in the United States, opportunities to expose civilian and military leaders from SPP host countries to these forces and practices are indispensable in moving from an abstraction to reality.

The National Guard's goal is to demonstrate, through the example of the citizen soldier, the role of the military in a democratic society. That the model of the National Guard may be out of reach now for most host countries, does not diminish its value. The intent of these recommendations is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the partnership, and hopefully provide a framework for which all states can use to improve their programs which supports the interests of the United States and its allies.

CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the (other) NATO nations' reserve forces can mirror what the US National Guard State Partnership Program has demonstrated.

—NATO Deputy Secretary General Sergio Balanzino

Through engagement, we increase stability and keep that threat of conflict at the lowest level possible. By engaging during peacetime, we shape the security environment, develop coalition partners, help prevent crises from occurring, and deter violence and armed conflict.²⁸ Engagement can take many different forms including training, combined exercises, security assistance and forward deployment, all which deters aggression and coercion, reducing conflicts and threats and allows American forces to serve as role models for military forces in emerging democracies.²⁹ Considering the increase in military obligations around the globe and the decrease in personnel and financial resources available to the U.S. armed forces, it is essential for the military to operate in the most effective and efficient manner possible. The National Guard's participation in SPP, JCTP and PfP has proven to be a successful engagement program that fulfills that need.

The National Guard's State Partnership Program has continued to be a particularly effective advocate for democratic ideals and civilian control of the military. The Guard provides a tangible example of the American concept of the citizen-soldier as these countries are guided toward transparent, defense-oriented militaries. The activities of the State Partnership Program have resulted in lasting relationships with key elements of society in the former Iron Curtain countries.

The old Cold War commitment for reservists, which called for duty on one weekend a month and two weeks each summer, is largely a thing of the past. Reservists today perform many vital functions. Charles Cragin, Principal Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for personnel

and Readiness stated, “The bottom line is that the U.S. armed forces cannot go to war, enforce a peace agreement or undertake prolonged humanitarian missions anywhere in the world today without calling on the Guard and Reserve. The fact remains that we are deeply dependent upon the core competencies embedded in the Guard and Reserve, and we will continue to call on them to make critical contributions to missions and operations around the world. The role of our reserve force is changing, those changes are influencing policy in important ways, and they tell us new things about the future direction of America’s military. The men and women of the Guard and Reserve are not weekend warriors anymore.”³⁰

The evidence found in this study validates the uniqueness of the National Guard as a force multiplier and the SPP as a vital enhancement to peacetime engagement programs. The conclusion of this study is that the National Guard State Partnership program is an effective element in promoting national security and advocates expanded program use.

Word count = 6,109

ENDNOTES

¹ Edward D. Baca, Chief, National Guard Bureau. "Chief, National Guard Bureau General Officer Steering Committee on National Guard Involvement in International Affairs." Available from http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/images/Annex_A.jpg. Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

² Walt W. Rostow, "Lessons of the Plan: Looking Forward to the Next Century," Foreign Affairs, (May/June 1997).

³ William Perry, Address to the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, May 13, 1996.

⁴ National Guard Bureau. A Bridge to America: The Citizen-Soldier Globally Engaged, Point Paper. 18 February 1998. Available from <http://www.ppc.pims.org/Projects/NGB/program.html> Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

⁵ William J. Clinton, A National Security Strategy for a New Century (Washington, D.C.: The White House, December 1999), 29.

⁶ Michael Dubie, "The National Guard: Promoting United States national security," National Guard, 9 (September 1998): 80.

⁷ James Swihart, "Europe: How Much Unity, How Effective?" in Strategic Assessment 1999: Priorities for a Turbulent World, ed. Hans Binnendijk (Washington, D.C., 1999), 69.

⁸ Clinton, 29.

⁹ United States European Command Theater Strategy, 2000, p. 2; On-line Internet, 12 December 2000, available from <http://www.eucom.mil>.

¹⁰ Clinton, 29-39.

¹¹ John M. Shalikashvili, National Military Strategy of the United States of America (Washington, D.C.: Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, September 1997), 11-12.

¹² Stephen J. Blank, "Russia and the Baltics in the Age of NATO Enlargement," Parameters, 28 (Autumn 1998), 50-68.

¹³ Congress, Senate, Armed Services Committee, Statement of General Wesley K. Clark, Commander in Chief, United States European Command, 29 February 2000, 26-27.

¹⁴ Charles Cragin, "Defense Leaders Commentary: The Guard and Reserve Contract Has Changed," American Forces Information Services News Articles, 29 August 2000.

¹⁵ Dubie, 80.

¹⁶ Shalikashvili, 7.

¹⁷ NATO Ministerial Communiqué, Annex to M-1 94 2, (1994).

¹⁸ NATO Office of Information and Press, NATO Handbook, (Brussels, Belgium: 1999), 92.

¹⁹ "Joint Contact Team Program," 11 December 2000, available from <http://www.eucom.mil>. accessed 13 November 2000.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ National Guard Bureau International Affairs Division, 27 November 2000, available from <http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/default.htm>; Internet; accessed 7 December 2000.

²² Mark L. Kalber, "The National Guard State Partnership Program: A Bridge to America," Army, April 1998, p44.

²³ C.A. Reimer, The National Guard State Partnership Program, Information Paper (National Guard Bureau Directorate of International Affairs, 1999), 1.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ John R. Groves Jr., "PfP and the state partnership program: Fostering engagement and progress," Parameters, Spring 1999.

²⁶ Michael Fleming, "The State to State Partnership Program," NATO Review, 45 (May-June 1997), 23.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Wesley K. Clark, Commander in Chief, United States European Command, Before the Senate Armed Services Committee, February 29, 2000.

²⁹ Clinton, 8.

³⁰ Cragin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arflack, Norman E. The National Guard State Partnership Program: Is it Still Relevant? Strategic Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 1 April 1999.

Army National Guard. National Guard State Partnership Program, Information Paper. Available from http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/Documents/IA_INFO/SPP_information_papre.htm Internet. Accessed 7 September 2000.

Army National Guard. Slovakia-Indiana State Partnership Program, Information Paper. Available from http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/Documents/EU.../Slovakia_IN_SPP_information_papre.htm Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

Baca, Edward D., Chief, National Guard Bureau. "Chief, National Guard Bureau General Officer Steering Committee on National Guard Involvement in International Affairs." Available from http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/images/Annex_A.jpg. Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

Blank, Stephen J., Russia and the Baltics in the Age of NATO Enlargement," Parameters, 28 (Autumn 1998), 50-68

Caldera, Louis. "Speech Delivered at the Army National Guard Senior Leadership Conference," Washington DC, 28 January, 1999

Clark, Wesley K. Commander in Chief, United States European Command, Before the Senate Armed Services Committee, February 29, 2000.

Cline, Donald L. "Operation Garden Plot: The United States Civil Disturbance Plan 55-2," Available from <http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a36aa38d426088.htm>, Internet, Accessed 14 November 2000.

Cohen, William S. Annual Report to the President and the Congress. Washington, D.C.: Secretary of Defense, 2000.

Cohen, William S. Partnership for Peace. Washington, D.C.: Secretary of Defense, March 1996.

Cohen, William S. Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review. Washington, D.C.: Secretary of Defense, May 1997.

Cohen, William S. Reserve Component Programs. Washington, D.C.: Secretary of Defense, March 2000.

Cohen, William S. "The Atlantic Alliance: A view from the Pentagon," Joint Force Quarterly, (Spring 1999) 8-15.

Congress, Senate, Armed Services Committee, Statement of General Wesley K. Clark, Commander in Chief, United States European Command, 29 February 2000, 26-27.

Clark, Wesley K. "Meeting Future Military Challenges to NATO," Joint Force Quarterly, (Spring 1999) 41-46.

Clinton, William J. A National Security Strategy for a New Century. Washington, D.C.: The White House, December 1999.

Charles Cragin, "Defense Leaders Commentary: The Guard and Reserve Contract Has Changed," American Forces Information Services News Articles, 29 August 2000.

Cragin, Charles L. "Reserves Forces Role Changing," The Officer, (September 2000) 34.

de Leon, Rudy. "Close NATO's Capability Gap with Transatlantic Partnership." Aviation Week & Space Technology, 26 June, 2000.

Dubie, Michael D. "The National Guard: Promoting United States National Security," National Guard, (September 1998) 80-82.

Flemming, Michael. "The State to State Partnership Programme," NATO Review, (May 1997) 22-23.

Gehman, Harold W. JR. "Transforming NATO Defense Capabilities," Joint Force Quarterly, (Spring 1999) 47-51.

Gerry, Alexander A.C. and Sartori, Luigi. "NATO framework policy for reserves," The Officer, 76 (August 2000) 31.

Glazar, Paul J. "Uncommon Value," National Guard, 53 (March 1999) 44-46.

Glazar, Paul J. "Guardedly Optimistic," National Guard, 54 no. 3(March 2000) 52-55.

Groves, John R. "PfP and the state partnership program: Fostering engagement and progress." Parameters 29 (Spring 1999): 43-53.

International Affairs Directorate, "FY99 Annual Review." Memorandum. April 1999. Available from

http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/Documents/IA_INFO/ngbia_fy99_annual_review.htm. Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

Jacobs, Barry. "A Call for NATO Expansion," National Guard, 52 no. 2 (February 1998) 14-16.

"Joint Contact Team Program," 11 December 2000, available from <http://www.eucom.mil>. Accessed 13 November 2000.

Kalber, Mark L. "The National Guard State Partnership Program A Bridge to America." Army, (April 1998): 43.

Kugler, Richard L. "NATO Chronicle: The Cold War Years," Joint Force Quarterly, (Spring 1999) 8-15.

Lee, Deborah R. "Reserve Components in the 21st Century: An Evolving Resource," Officer, 74, no. 1 (January-February 1998) 36-40.

Maddaloni, Chris. "Reaching Around the World," National Guard, (July 2000) 18-23.

NATO Fact sheets, Partnership for Peace – An enhanced and more operational partnership, 6 September 2000.

NATO Ministerial Communiqué, Annex to M-1 (94) 2, 11 January 1994.

NATO Office of Information and Press, NATO Handbook, (Brussels, Belgium:1999), 92.

NATO Partnership for Peace: Appendix E, Improving Training and Education in Partnership for Peace, 15 June 1999.

National Defense Panel, Transforming Defense: National Security in the 21st Century, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 1997.

National Guard Association of the United States. National Military Strategy and The Rebuttable Presumption, 18 June 1997. Available from <http://www.ngaus.org/resources/rebuable.asp>. Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

National Guard Bureau. A Bridge to America: The Citizen-Soldier Globally Engaged, Point Paper. 18 February 1998. Available from <http://www.ppc.pims.org/Projects/NGB/program.html> Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

National Guard Bureau, International Affairs Directorate: FY99 Annual Review, 27 November 2000, available from http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/Documents/IA_INFO/ngbia_fy99_annual_review.htm Internet; accessed 7 December 2000.

National Guard Bureau, International Affairs Division, 27 November 2000, available from <http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/default.htm>; Internet; accessed 7 December 2000.

National Guard Bureau, NGB-IA Information Paper, "National Guard State Partnership Program," 14 November 2000.

National Guard Bureau. Operations of the Army National Guard. 1998. Available from <<http://www-ngb5.ngb.army.mil/home/statements/finrep98/html/cinc.htm>> Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

National Guard Bureau. Presence: 131 Armories in 119 Communities. 1998. Available from <<http://www-ngb5.ngb.army.mil/home/statements/finrep98/html/california.htm>> Internet. Accessed 18 August 2000.

National Guard Bureau. State Partnership Program SOP. Available from <<http://www.ang.af.mil/ngbia/SOPs/SOPs.htm>> Internet. Accessed 13 November 2000.

Perry, William, Address to the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, May 13, 1996.

Philpott, Tom. "Citizen Warriors of Today," Retired Officer, 56, no. 8 (August 2000) 32-34.

Plewes, Thomas. "Reserve Is Indispensable For 21st Century Army," Officer, (January-February 2000) 44-47.

Puckett, Bettina E. "Michigan: Camp hosts exercise with Baltic countries," National Guard, 53, no. 8(August 1999) 28.

Reimer, C.A. The National Guard State Partnership Program, Information Paper(National Guard Bureau Directorate of International Affairs, 1999), 1.

Rostow, Walt W., "Lessons of the Plan: Looking Forward to the Next Century," Foreign Affairs, (May/June 1997).

Roth, William V. and Sloan, Stanley R. "The Atlantic Alliance: A View from the Capitol Hill, (Spring 1999) 25-30.

Saratori, Luigi "NATO framework policy for reserves," The Officer, 76, August 2000: 31.

Schultz, Roger C. Army National Guard: Fiscal Year 2000 Posture Statement, Arlington, Virginia: Army National Guard, 1999.

Schultz, Roger C. Army National Guard: Fiscal Year 2001 Posture Statement, Arlington, Virginia: Army National Guard, 2000.

Shalikashvili, John M. National Military Strategy of the United States of America (Washington, D.C.: Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, September 1997), 11-12.

Solana, Javier. "NATO: Prospects for the Next Fifty Years," Joint Force Quarterly, (Spring 1999) 35-40.

Swihart, James, "Europe: How Much Unity, How Effective?" in Strategic Assessment 1999: Priorities for a Turbulent World, ed. Hans Binnendijk (Washington, D.C., 1999), 69."The National Guard and Reserve - America's Force in Reserve," Available from http://www.dtic.mil/execsec/adr95/rc_5.html Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

United States European Command. State Partnership Program. Available from <http://www.eucom.mil/programs/spp> Internet. Accessed 14 November 2000.

United States European Command. Theater Strategy, 2000, p. 2; On-line Internet, 12 December 2000, available from <http://www.eucom.mil>. Accessed 14 November 2000.

Vershbow, Alexander R. "European Security and Defense Identity: Berlin, St. Malo, and Beyond," Joint Force Quarterly, (Spring 1999) 52-53.

Webb, Charles R. Georgia to Georgia: A Case for the National Guard State Partnership Program. Strategic Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 10 April 2000.

Wolfe, Colleen. "Partners for Peace: California Guard Reaches Out Across the Globe to Provide Stability," National Guard, 52 no. 2 (February 1998) 17.